

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/569,000	HANNAH ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
CATHY K. WORLEY	1638	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Rejected

(1) CATHY K. WORLEY. (3) _____.

(2) DORAN R. PACE. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 October 2010

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Cathy K. Worley/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called on Oct. 21, 2010, and spoke with the Applicant's attorney, Doran Pace. The Examiner indicated that claims limited in scope to claim 4 would be allowable, and this would be an allowable linking claim, therefore, any claims that are linked by claim 4 would be rejoined because all claims that include the limitations of claim 4 as their special technical feature would have unity of invention over the prior art. The Examiner wanted to know if the Applicant would give permission to Examiner's amendments that would re-write claim 4 in independent format, cancel claims 1-3, and amend the remaining claims to be of the same scope. The Examiner based this determination on the data provided in Table 3 on page 31 of the specification. The attorney consulted with the applicant and called the Examiner back on Oct. 22, 2010. The attorney informed the Examiner that the Applicant did not want to agree to these amendments at this point in time, and indicated that they would prefer to have a rejection in writing before they cancel claims and narrow their claims.